

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **8 July 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-34. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-13, 15, 17-22, and 24-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rothrock (USPN 5,408,470, hereinafter “Rothrock”). Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 15-22, and 24-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Zhu (USPN 6,792,436, hereinafter “Zhu”). Claims 3 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothrock. Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothrock in view of Zhu.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Rothrock and Zhu.

Applicant respectfully points out that Rothrock is directed towards deferred synchronization of a list of objects. The invention of Rothrock ensures that all participants of a meeting have the same list of objects by adding or deleting objects from the list (see Rothrock, col. 9, line 60 through col. 12, line 46). Similarly, the invention of Zhu is also directed towards synchronizing a list of objects by adding or deleting different versions of objects from a cache. Note that when the invention of Zhu updates an object in a cache, it (a) receives a new version of the entire object, (b) deletes the old version of the object, and (c) adds the new version of the entire object into the cache (see Zhu, col. 6, lines 12-28). To summarize, the inventions of Rothrock and Zhu do not change individual fields (or attributes) of an object. Instead, the inventions of Rothrock and Zhu **add or delete entire objects** from a list of objects.

In contrast, the present invention is directed towards synchronizing two copies of an object by **changing individual attributes of an object**. Specifically,

the present invention synchronizes two copies of an object by (a) determining an object change set at a first system which includes the names of the object attributes that have changed and the new values for those attributes, (b) sending the object change set to a second system, and (c) applying the object change set to the corresponding object on the second system to synchronize the object on the second system with the object on the first system (see page 8, lines 5-13, 21-30, page 11, lines 1-7, 15-20). An example of an object change set can be found on page 9, line 13 through page 10, line 14 of the instant application.

Synchronizing two copies of an object by changing individual attributes of the object is different from synchronizing a list of objects by adding or deleting entire objects from the list. There nothing within Rothrock or Zhu, either implicit or explicit, which suggests synchronizing two copies of an object by changing individual attributes of the object.

Note that synchronizing two copies of an object by changing individual attributes of the object is advantageous because it requires less data to be communicated over a communication link for synchronization purposes (see page 8, line 1-2).

Furthermore, synchronizing two copies of an object by changing individual attributes of the object is not obvious. The present invention synchronizes two copies of an object by performing the complex operations described on page 9, line 13 through page 10, line 14. In particular, the present invention uses a “merging unit” to change attributes of the object (FIG. 5, 502).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to clarify that the system determines an object change set which includes (a) a primary key value that identifies the object, and (b) a set of attribute changes which contain the attribute names and the new attribute values for the attributes that were changed in the object. These amendments are supported on page 8, lines 5-13, 21-30, page 11, lines 1-7, 15-20, and page 9, line 13 through page 10,


line 14 of the instant application. Furthermore, Applicant has canceled claims 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, and 30 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3, 5-7 and 11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13, 15-16 and 20, which depend upon claim 12, claims 22-24, which depend upon claim 21, and claims 29 and 31, which depend upon claim 28, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
A. Richard Park  
Registration No. 41,241

Date: 4 October 2005

A. Richard Park  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1661  
FAX: (530) 759-1665